NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

CONCEPTUAL REVOLUTIONS IN TWENTIETH-CENTURY ART

David Galenson

Working Paper 15073
http://www.nber.org/papers/w15073

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
June 2009

Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art
David Galenson
NBER Working Paper No. 15073
June 2009
JEL No. Z1,Z11

ABSTRACT

Art critics and scholars have acknowledged the breakdown of their explanations and narratives of contemporary art in the face of what they consider the incoherent era of "pluralism" or "postmodernism" that began in the late twentieth century. This failure is in fact a result of their inability to understand the nature of the development of advanced art throughout the entire twentieth century, and particularly the novel behavior of young conceptual innovators in a new market environment. The rise of a competitive market for advanced art in the late nineteenth century freed artists from the constraint of having to satisfy powerful patrons, and gave them unprecedented freedom to innovate. As the rewards for radical and conspicuous innovation increased, conceptual artists could respond to these incentives more quickly and decisively than their experimental counterparts. Early in the twentieth century, the young conceptual genius Pablo Picasso initiated two new practices, by alternating styles at will and inventing a new artistic genre, that became basic elements of the art of a series of later conceptual innovators. By the late twentieth century, extensions of these practices had led to the emergence of important individual artists whose work appeared to have no unified style, and to the balkanization of advanced art, as the dominance of painting gave way before novel uses of old genres and the creation of many new ones. Understanding not only contemporary art, but the art of the past century as a whole, will require art scholars to abandon their outmoded insistence on analyzing art in terms of style, and to recognize the many novel patterns of behavior that have been created over the course of the past century by young conceptual innovators.

David Galenson
Department of Economics
University of Chicago
1126 East 59th Street
Chicago, IL 60637
and NBER
galenson@uchicago.edu

Pluralism, Postmodernism, and Perplexed Art Pundits

> Painters no longer live within a tradition and so each of us must recreate an entire language.
>
> Pablo Picasso[1]

> Well, thank God, art tends to be less what critics write than what artists make.
>
> Jasper Johns[2]

In 2005, Peter Schjeldahl wrote in the *New Yorker* that "The contemporary art world of the 1980s blew apart into four main fragments … Eventually, even the fragments disintegrated, becoming the sluggish mishmash that has prevailed in art ever since."[3] The idea that advanced art had become fragmented in the late twentieth century was not a new one. In 1984, for example, the art historian Corinne Robins titled her survey of American art during 1968-1981 *The Pluralist Era*, and on the first page observed that "the Pluralism of the seventies … effectively did away with the idea of dominant styles for at least a decade."[4] Over time, another term gained currency to describe the situation, as in 2000 Jonathan Fineberg explained in his textbook, *Art Since 1940*, that what had emerged in the seventies was *postmodernism*, "an inclusive aesthetic that cultivates the variety of incoherence."[5]

Whatever name they give to the situation, there is widespread agreement among art critics and scholars that they have lost the ability to provide any convincing overall narrative or explanation for the art of the late twentieth century and beyond. The critic Arthur Danto, for example, remarked in 1997 that "contemporary art no longer allows itself to be represented by master narratives at all."[6] One of the most remarkable admissions was made in 2004 by Hal Foster of Princeton University. On p. 679 of *Art Since 1900* – the final page of a textbook that he co-authored with Rosalind Krauss of Columbia, Yve-Alain Bois of Harvard, and Benjamin

Buchloh of Columbia – Foster raised "a question we haven't confronted," and reflected as follows:

> Are there plausible ways to narrate the now myriad practices of contemporary art over the last twenty years at least? I don't point to this period of time arbitrarily: in the last several years the two primary models we've used to articulate different aspects of postwar art have become dysfunctional. I mean, on the one hand, the model of a medium-specific modernism challenged by an interdisciplinary postmodernism, and, on the other, the model of a historical avant-garde (i.e. ones critical of the old bourgeois institution of art such as Dada and Constructivism) and a neo-avant-garde that elaborates on this critique … Today the recursive strategy of the "neo" appears as attenuated as the oppositional logic of the "post" seems tired: neither suffices as a strong paradigm for artistic or cultural practice, and no other model stands in their stead; or, put differently, many local models compete, but none can hope to be paradigmatic. And we should note too that the methods discussed again here – psychoanalysis, Marxian social history, structuralism, and poststructuralism – are hardly thriving.

Foster's statement is startling, for it is no less than a declaration by a leading art scholar, made with the approval of three peers, that no existing analysis can account for the art of recent decades. The interest of this conundrum is heightened by the fact that – as Foster immediately proceeded to observe – contemporary art is thriving in the marketplace.[7]

What the art experts have consistently failed to recognize is that what they call pluralism or postmodernism did not arise spontaneously in the late twentieth century, but was instead a logical – indeed, systematic – extension of practices that originated at the beginning of the twentieth century, and that developed throughout the decades that followed. This paper will present a new explanation for the nature of contemporary art, based on the proposition that it is largely the consistent product of a specific type of artistic creativity, operating in a particular market environment.

The Two Faces of Artistic Creativity

> Does creation reside in the idea or in the action?
>
> Sir Alan Bowness[8]

> Probably the most major piece I'm ever going to make in my lifetime I made right at the beginning.
>
> Damien Hirst[9]

Important artists are innovators. They can be divided into two types, on the basis of differences in their goals, methods, and achievements.

Experimental innovators seek to record visual perceptions. Their goals are imprecise, so they proceed tentatively, by trial and error. The imprecision of their goals rarely allows them to feel that they have succeeded, and they often spend their careers pursuing a single objective. They consider making art a process of searching, in which they want to discover images in the course of making them. They build their skills gradually, and their innovations emerge piecemeal in a body of work.

Conceptual innovators express ideas or emotions. Their goals can be stated precisely, so they usually plan their works, and execute them systematically. Their innovations are conspicuous, transgressive, and often irreverent. Their innovations appear suddenly, as a new idea produces a result quite different not only from other artists' work, but also from their own previous work.

The long periods of trial and error typically required for important experimental innovations means that they tend to occur late in an artist's life. Radical conceptual innovations depend on the ability to recognize the potential gains from extreme deviations from existing conventions, and this ability declines with experience, as habits of thought become fixed. The most important conceptual innovations consequently occur early in an artist's career.[10]

Both experimental and conceptual innovators have played on important role throughout the history of western art. So for example the Old Masters Jan van Eyck, Masaccio, Giorgione,

Raphael, Caravaggio, and Vermeer were great conceptual innovators, while Leonardo, Michelangelo, Titian, Hals, Velazquez, and Rembrandt were great experimental innovators.[11] The conceptual innovators Courbet, Manet, Gauguin, and van Gogh were among the greatest artists of the nineteenth century, as were the experimental innovators Degas, Cézanne, Monet, and Renoir.[12] For centuries, neither type of innovator dominated advanced art. This changed, however, in the twentieth century, as conceptual innovators gained an advantage over their experimental counterparts. This advantage stemmed from a change in the structure of the market for advanced art.

The Rise of a Competitive Market for Art

> Painting has lost a lot of the functions that once used to provide discipline and continuity. I mean commissioned art, from portraiture to whatever, which only incidentally gave painters the chance to make art. Nowadays they can't do anything *but* make art. That alters a lot.
>
> Gerhard Richter[13]

> The market is the greatest critic.
>
> Jeff Koons[14]

During the late nineteenth century, a momentous change in the market for art set the stage for an unprecedented era of revolutionary artistic change. In 1874, frustrated at their lack of success in having their paintings accepted and displayed at the official Salon, the annual or biennial exhibition operated by the Academy of Fine Arts, Claude Monet and a group of his friends organized an independent exhibition that included paintings by 29 artists. Although its full significance would not become apparent until much later, the first Impressionist exhibition began a new era, in which the reputations of important advanced artists would no longer be created in the Salon, but would instead be made in independent group exhibitions. The most important of these would be the eight Impressionist exhibitions held during 1874-86, and the

Salon des Indépendants, which was held annually from 1884 on. Analytically, the critical change that the Impressionists initiated in 1874 was the elimination of the official Salon's monopoly of the ability to present fine art in a setting that critics and the public would accept as legitimate. The Salon consequently would no longer determine whether an aspiring artist could have a successful career.[15]

A competitive market for advanced art did not immediately come into existence, however, because of the slow emergence of private galleries that were willing to sell the work of younger artists: it was not until the early twentieth century that the number of independent entrepreneurial galleries would grow large enough to create a genuinely competitive market.[16] The increase in these galleries reflected the growing awareness of the potential gains from investing in innovative art, as the prices of work not only by Monet and the other Impressionists but also by the Post-Impressionists Cézanne, van Gogh, and Gauguin began to increase during the 1890s. By 1910, the leading critic of the advanced art world, the poet Guillaume Apollinaire, observed that "The plethora of individual exhibitions tends to weaken the effect of the large annual salons. The public is less keen, since many painters have already shown in the galleries the most important, if not the best, examples of their work during the year."[17] Over time, private galleries would replace group exhibitions altogether as the key exhibition places for new advanced art, not only in Paris, but also in other art centers.

The first artist to rise to prominence by exhibiting in galleries rather than group shows was Pablo Picasso. Early in his career, Picasso used his art to cultivate merchants in the art market who could sell his work and spread his reputation. It is possible that no artist has painted more different dealers: during his first two decades in Paris, Picasso executed portraits of no less than nine dealers, and the wife of a tenth.[18] The effect was telling. When the Italian painter

Umberto Boccioni visited Paris in 1911, he reported to a friend that "The young man ruling the roost here now is Picasso… [T]he painter scarcely finishes a work before it is carted off and paid for by the dealers in competition with each other."[19] Picasso's portraits of Ambroise Vollard, Daniel-Henry Kahnweiler, Paul Rosenberg, and a succession of other gallery owners stand today as powerful visual evidence of the birth of a new regime in the history of art markets, that in turn created a new era of artistic freedom.

The story of the Impressionists' challenge to the official Salon has long been a staple in narratives of art history, but art scholars have never fully appreciated the significance of the changes it initiated. Innovation had always been the hallmark of important art, but from the Renaissance on nearly all artists were constrained in the extent to which they could innovate by the need to satisfy powerful individual patrons or institutions. The overthrow of the Salon monopoly of the art market in Paris started a process that led to the creation of a competitive market for the innovative work of advanced artists. This removed the constraint of patronage, and gave artists a greater freedom to innovate. Perhaps not surprisingly, the first great artist to take real advantage of competition among dealers was the greatest of the young conceptual innovators of the new era.

<u>The Dematerialization of Style</u>

> Picasso in each one of his facets, has made clear his intention to keep free from preceding achievements.
>
> Marcel Duchamp[20]

> How can you say one style is better than another? You should be able to be an Abstract Expressionist next week, or a Pop artist, or a realist, without feeling you've given up something.
>
> Andy Warhol[21]

> I've never been able to stick to one thing.
>
> Bruce Nauman[22]

In 1985, the eminent art historian Meyer Schapiro observed that “If the works of Pablo Picasso were not identified directly with his name, if they were shown together in a big exhibition, it would be rather difficult to say they were the work of one man.”[23] In 1996, the art historian David Campbell observed that “visiting a [Sigmar] Polke exhibition is often like wandering around a group show.”[24] And in 2002, the critic Arthur Danto observed that “when I first saw a retrospective of [Gerhard] Richter’s work … it looked like I was seeing some kind of group show.”[25]

It is striking that three different authors used precisely the same metaphor to describe their bewilderment at the stylistic versatility of three different painters. Yet each made this observation in isolation, without recognizing the common element in the practices of the artists in question. Nor are these three artists the only ones who have prompted this reaction. So for example the artist William Anastasi recalled that what had struck him when he first saw the Arensberg collection at the Philadelphia Museum was “that every Duchamp was so completely different from every other Duchamp.”[26] In 1949, in a tribute to his old friend Francis Picabia, Marcel Duchamp described Picabia’s career as “a kaleidoscopic series of art experiences … hardly related to one another in their external appearances.”[27] The painter and photographer Man Ray, a friend of both Duchamp and Picabia, explained that he made sudden changes in the style of his work because “I enjoyed contradicting myself.”[28]

The practice of stylistic versatility is a pattern, that has been followed by a series of important artists of the past century. It is a practice that has been consciously learned by these artists, from the examples of their predecessors. Bruce Nauman’s art, for instance, is so varied in form that Peter Schjeldahl declared in 2002 that “There is no Nauman style.”[29] Nauman has explained that early in his career he was influenced by a retrospective exhibition of the work of

Man Ray: “What I liked was that there appeared to be no consistency to his thinking, no one style.”[30] And Gerhard Richter observed in 1977 that “changeable artists are a growing phenomenon. Picasso, for instance, or Duchamp and Picabia – and the number is certainly increasing all the time.”[31]

Throughout the twentieth century, a succession of important artists – including, for example, not only Picasso, Duchamp, Picabia, Richter, Polke, and Nauman, but also Max Ernst, Richard Hamilton, Robert Rauschenberg, Andy Warhol, David Hockney, Jeff Koons, Damien Hirst, and Tracey Emin – have changed styles frequently and at will. This practice has been a novel feature of twentieth-century art, that was initiated by Picasso. Thus in 1996 the eminent English critic David Sylvester reflected that “Picasso is a kind of artist who couldn’t have existed before this century, since his art is a celebration of this century’s introduction of a totally promiscuous eclecticism into the practice of art.”[32]

Style had traditionally been regarded as the essential signature of the artist, but Picasso considered it instead to be merely a means of expression: “Whenever I had something to say, I have said it in the manner in which I have felt it ought to be said.” This attitude implied that he could change styles as the need arose: “Different motives inevitably require different methods of expression.”[33] Instead of treating style as the artist’s personal hallmark, and as something to be painstakingly crafted, Picasso had created a radical new conceptual approach that reduced style to a convenient means of making a specific statement. In this new formulation, the artist could introduce new styles at will, or alternate between existing styles, as a matter of convenience. This was a powerful new conception of style, that could readily be adopted by other conceptual artists. Thus Duchamp paid tribute to Picasso for representing “the living expression of a new thought in the realm of esthetics… This will be Picasso’s main contribution to art. To have been

able to start from a new source, and to keep this freshness with regard to whatever new expressions mark the different epochs of his career."[34]

It was not long before other artists followed Picasso's lead. Duchamp adopted an even more extreme position, in an attempt to eliminate style altogether. His introduction of the readymade was one manifestation of his desire to abolish taste, which he considered to be a product of repetition.[35] Avoiding repetition would consequently eliminate taste, and incidentally style, so Duchamp's goal was to make just one work for each idea: "I've had thirty-three ideas; I've made thirty-three paintings."[36] Duchamp's friend Picabia shared his belief in frequent change, declaring that "If you want to have clean ideas, change them as often as you change your shirts."[37] Dada became the first artistic group that effectively made the elimination of style a collective goal, as the painter Hans Richter explained that the movement aimed at "riot, destruction, defiance, confusion. The role of chance, not as an extension of the scope of art, but as a principle of dissolution and anarchy."[38] Picasso, Duchamp, Picabia, and the Dadas created a legacy that reverberated throughout advanced art in the generations that followed. Following their examples, artists could consider style not as a goal, but as a strategy, and if they wished, they could dispense with it altogether.

One key characteristic unifies all the versatile artistic innovators of the twentieth century, from Picasso and Duchamp through Hirst and Emin: all are conceptual artists. Their behavior in changing styles made their careers differ radically from those of experimental artists. For the century's great experimental innovators, from Mondrian and Kandinsky through Pollock and Rothko and beyond, art remained a lifelong quest along a single path toward the one true personal style. Their styles evolved over time, slowly and gradually. Even late in the century, the experimental painter Brice Marden explained that he was inspired by Cézanne's "intense, long,

slow process of working, looking, assimilating," and the experimental sculptor Louise Bourgeois reflected that her style had been hard won: "My style, the way I work comes from all the failures, all the temptations I have resisted, all the fun I didn't have, all the regrets."[39]

The protean innovator is a radical conceptual creation of the twentieth century, and as Gerhard Richter recognized, its importance has increased over time. By the end of the twentieth century, many of the central figures in advanced art, including Rauschenberg, Richter, Koons, Hirst, and Emin, were conceptual contributors to the dematerialization of style. Thus for example Richter could reflect in 1984 that "It has now become my identifying characteristic that my work is all over the place."[40]

The Balkanization of Advanced Art

> What is sculpture? What is painting? Everyone's still clinging to outdated ideas, obsolete definitions, as if the artist's role was not precisely to offer new ones.
>
> Pablo Picasso[41]

> Art used to mean paintings and statues. Now it means practically anything human-made that is unclassifiable otherwise.
>
> Peter Schjeldahl[42]

The pluralism of the late twentieth century was not solely the product of the dematerialization of style, for it was also caused by another powerful trend that had also been active throughout nearly the entire century, that was also initiated by Picasso. This trend affected not only the appearance of art, but its very substance.

In 1912, Picasso glued a piece of oil cloth to a small oval painting. *Still Life with Chair Caning* became one of the most important works of art of the twentieth century, for it was the first *collage* – "the first painting in which extraneous objects or materials are applied to the picture surface." Collage violated a tradition that had been honored by artists since the Renaissance, that nothing other than paint should be placed on the two-dimensional surface of

the support, and John Golding observed that "The aesthetic implications of collage as a whole were vast."[43] Yet the implications of collage went far beyond the aesthetic, for when he invented a new genre, Picasso set in motion a process that would make the art of the twentieth century fundamentally different in form from that of all earlier centuries.

Collage was an archetypal conceptual innovation, for it broke the rules of an existing art form so decisively that it was immediately recognized as a new genre. And its example quickly inspired other conceptual innovators. Before 1912 was out, Picasso's fellow Cubist Georges Braque had made the first papier collé. In 1913, after a visit to Picasso's studio, the Russian artist Vladimir Tatlin made the first counter-relief. Also in 1913, Marcel Duchamp made the first readymade.

And on and on. *During the twentieth century, at least four dozen new artistic genres were invented, virtually all by conceptual innovators.*[44] These were not all of equal importance: many gained few followers, and some remained the exclusive domain of their inventors. Yet some rose to great prominence, and a key result of this proliferation of genres was that over the course of the twentieth century the world of advanced art became balkanized. This process was at work throughout the century, but during the first half of the century two world wars and a great depression appear to have restricted its progress by limiting the market for new art. In contrast, the prosperity of the 1960s and after, which created a strong demand for innovative art, provided the basis for the widespread adoption of new genres by ambitious young artists. At the beginning of the twentieth century, important artists were either painters or sculptors. In contrast, by the century's end, painters and sculptors had been joined by sizeable numbers of artists who devoted themselves to such other genres as collage, installation, photography, and video.

And the real extent of balkanization is even greater than a listing of active genres implies, for in many cases in which recent artists have not given new names to their innovative practices, they have nevertheless radically expanded the boundaries of existing genres. It is highly unlikely, for example, that Rodin or Brancusi would recognize as sculpture many of the recent works that are given that label. Arthur Danto noticed this: "some of the most interesting artists of the middle to late sixties – Bruce Nauman, Robert Morris, Robert Irwin, Eva Hesse – began as painters, but found painting constraining. It is not as though they turned to sculpture as such, for the connotation of sculpture would have been no less constraining at the time. All that the work of these artists had in common with sculpture was a real third dimension, which somehow seems of marginal relevance, the way it is undeniable but also irrelevant that dance is three-dimensional."[45] Robert Smithson was another artist of the '60s who began as a painter but soon turned to sculpture, and in the process exploded that genre's traditional boundaries. In 1967 he observed that the conventional division of art into painting, architecture, and sculpture had been unfortunate, and added that "Now all these categories are splintering into more and more categories, and it's like an interminable avalanche of categories."[46]

One important tendency of balkanization has been to limit the importance of individual artists. In art, as in other intellectual activities, importance is a function of influence, and balkanization has tended to limit the sphere of influence of artists. Until recently, a painter could influence nearly all advanced artists, so Picasso, Pollock, or Warhol could be dominant figures in the entire art world. Today it is more difficult for any one artist to reach all these groups. This trend away from dominant individual artists is heightened by the nature of conceptual artists' life cycles, for many radical young innovators have failed to make any later significant contributions.[47]

A Conceptual World

> I paint objects as I think them, not as I see them.
>
> Pablo Picasso[48]

> I wanted to put painting once again at the service of the mind.
>
> Marcel Duchamp[49]

In 2001, Arthur Danto declared that "We are living in a conceptual art world."[50] The observation was accurate, but tardy. The conceptual art world of the late twentieth century developed clearly and directly from the earlier conceptual innovations of Picasso, Duchamp, and their many heirs. Art scholars' failure to understand this process has led to their inability to make sense of contemporary art.

Art scholars invariably approach the history of art as the analysis of styles. This left them helpless when style dematerialized in the work of many artists late in the twentieth century. *Art scholars don't understand that style was one casualty of the conceptual revolutions in twentieth-century art.* Art scholars have long stubbornly refused to recognize the fundamental role of markets and economic incentives in the production of advanced art. They have also resisted systematic analysis of artists' differing approaches to creativity. Yet adopting these analytical tools is essential to an understanding of the nature of contemporary art. Conceptual and experimental artists had coexisted throughout the entire history of western art, but the constraints imposed by patronage had the effect of making it possible for scholars to treat their works as comparable products for the period prior to the modern era. With the rise of a competitive market for advanced art, the rewards for radical innovation increased, conceptual artists could respond to these incentives more quickly and decisively than their experimental counterparts, and their work diverged more conspicuously from that of their experimental contemporaries. Art scholars must

embrace new analytical methods if they are to recognize these patterns, and understand how and why the past century was genuinely an age of revolutionary conceptual artistic change.

And Now for Something Completely Different

> Another important value of the modern artist is that his art is completely free. There are no rules, no hierarchy of privileged qualities, no absolute standards, characteristics, or codified methods, and there are no privileged materials.
>
> Meyer Schapiro[51]

> Art is invention, exciting and fantastic … When someone tells me I can't do something, so far I've always found out that I can.
>
> Damien Hirst[52]

During the twentieth century conceptual innovators began regularly to make rapid changes of style, and to create works that intentionally violated the boundaries of traditional artistic genres. But the creativity of conceptual innovators has not been limited to these activities, for they have also engaged in a series of other behaviors that are novel within the context of all earlier art history. Thus they have intentionally provoked observers to ponder the question of whether their work is serious or a joke; they have had their work executed entirely by others, thereby highlighting the conceptual nature of their involvement; they have consistently co-authored their work; they have greatly extended the use of language in art, and in some instances have made art wholly out of language; they have created personal art, making their art entirely out of their own lives; and they have openly embraced the market, and cited the high prices of their work as evidence of their success. [53]

These are all significant features of twentieth-century art: they are *patterns*, created by systematic artistic behavior. Yet these patterns, and their effects, have been largely overlooked by art scholars, for they do not involve style, and their identification requires systematic generalization. In 1933, Roger Fry appealed to his fellow art scholars, pleading that "we have

such a crying need for systematic study in which scientific methods will be followed wherever possible, where at all events the scientific attitude may be fostered and the sentimental attitude discouraged."[54] Art historians ignored Fry's appeal then. If they continue to do so, the cost will be not only a continuing inability to understand contemporary advanced art, but also an inability to understand the art of the twentieth century as a whole.

Footnotes

I thank Hasan Bakhshi, Robert Jensen, and Joshua Kotin for discussions and comments.

1. Francoise Gilot and Carlton Lake, *Life With Picasso* (New York: Doubleday, 1989), p. 75.

2. Jasper Johns, *Writings, Sketchbook Notes, Interviews* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1996), p. 19.

3. Peter Schjeldahl, *Let's See* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2008), pp. 182-183.

4. Corinne Robins, *The Pluralist Era* (New York: Harper and Row, 1984), p. 1.

5. Jonathan Fineberg, *Art Since 1940*, second ed. (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2000), p. 365.

6. Arthur Danto, *After the End of Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. xiii.

7. Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, and Benjamin Buchloch, *Art Since 1900* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 2004), p. 679.

8. Alan Bowness, *Modern European Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1972), p. 73.

9. Damien Hirst and Gordon Burn, *On the Way to Work* (New York: Universe Publishing, 2002), p. 134.

10. For a more detailed discussion of these two types, see David W. Galenson, *Old Masters and Young Geniuses* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), Chap. 1.

11. Robert Jensen, "Anticipating Artistic Behavior: New Research Tools for Art Historians," *Historical Methods*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (2004), pp. 137-153.

12. David W. Galenson, *Painting Outside the Lines* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), Chap. 6.

13. Gerhard Richter, *The Daily Practice of Painting* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995), p. 93.

14. Anthony Haden-Guest, *True Colors* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1996), p. 151.

15. David W. Galenson and Robert Jensen, "Careers and Canvases: The Rise of the Market for Modern Art in Nineteenth-Century Paris," *Van Gogh Studies*, Vol. 1 (2007), pp. 137-66.

16. Galenson and Jensen, "Careers and Canvases," pp. 155-158.

17. Guillaume Apollinaire, *Apollinaire on Art* (Boston: MFA Publications, 2001), p. 75.

18. For a listing, see David W. Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and NBER, 2009), Chap. 15.

19. Ester Coen, *Umberto Boccioni* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1988), p. xlii.

20. Marcel Duchamp, *The Writings of Marcel Duchamp* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1989), p. 157.

21. Kenneth Goldstein, ed., *I'll Be Your Mirror*, (New York: Carroll and Graf, 2004), p. 17.

22. Bruce Nauman, *Please Pay Attention Please* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), p. 119.

23. Meyer Schapiro, *The Unity of Picasso's Art* (New York: George Braziller, 2000), p. 1.

24. David Campbell, "Plotting Polke," in David Thistlewood, ed., *Sigmar Polke* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996), p. 19.

25. Arthur Danto, *Unnatural Wonders* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 2005), p. 182.

26. Thomas McEvilley, *The Triumph of Anti-Art* (Kingston, New York: McPherson and Company, 2005), p. 105.

27. Michel Sanouillet and Elmer Peterson, eds., *The Writings of Marcel Duchamp* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1989), p. 156.

28. Man Ray, *Self Portrait* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1988), p. 299.

29. Schjeldahl, *Let's See*, p. 111.

30. Coosje van Bruggen, *Bruce Nauman* (New York: Rizzoli, 1988), p. 14.

31. Richter, *The Daily Practice of Painting*, pp. 92-93.

32. David Sylvester, *About Modern Art* (New York: Henry Holt, 1997), p. 30.

33. Alfred Barr, *Picasso* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1946), p. 271.

34. Duchamp, *The Writings of Marcel Duchamp*, p. 157.

35. Pierre Cabanne, *Dialogues with Marcel Duchamp* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1987), p. 48.

36. McEvilley, *The Triumph of Anti-Art*, p. 28.

37. William Camfield, *Francis Picabia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), p. xvi.

38. Hans Richter, *Dada* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1965), p. 48.

39. Michael Kimmelman, *Portraits* (New York: Modern Library, 1999), p. 198; Louise Bourgeois, *Destruction of the Father, Reconstruction of the Father* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998), p. 218.

40. Richter, *The Daily Practice of Painting*, p. 115.

41. Brassai, *Conversations with Picasso* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), p. 69.

42. Schjeldahl, *Let's See*, p. 222.

43. John Golding, *Cubism*, rev. ed. (Boston: Boston Book and Art Shop, 1968), pp. 103, 105.

44. Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art*, Chap 6.

45. Danto, *After the End of Art*, p. 170. More generally, Danto observed in 2003 that "There has been less and less painting in the recent Biennials, and less and less of what would even in modernist times have been regarded as sculpture. These traditional genres play a decreasingly central role in the contemporary system of the arts; "*The Abuse of Beauty* (Chicago: Open Court, 2003), p. 123.

46. Jack Flam, ed., *Robert Smithson: The Collected Writings* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), p. 48.

47. E.g. see David W. Galenson, "The Reappearing Masterpiece: Ranking American Artists and Art Works of the Late Twentieth Century," *Historical Methods*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (2005), pp. 178-88; and Galenson, "One-Hit Wonders: Why Some of the Most Important Works of Modern Art Are Not by Important Artists," *Historical Methods*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2005), pp. 101-117.

48. Golding, *Cubism*, p. 60.

49. Sanouillet and Peterson, *The Writings of Marcel Duchamp*, p. 125.

50. Danto, *Unnatural Wonders*, p. 99.

51. Meyer Schapiro, *Worldview in Painting – Art and Society* (New York: George Braziller, 1999), p. 144.

52. Gabriele Detterler, ed., *Art Recollection* (Florence: Danilo Montanari, 1997), p. 117.

53. All these innovative practices are discussed in Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art.*

54. Roger Fry, *Last Lectures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939), p. 3.